Before the Board of Zoning Adjustment, D. C.

PUBLIC HEARING-February 17, 1965

Appeal #8055 Harvey A. Graves, appellant.

The Zoning Administrator District of Columbia, appellee.

On motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried the following Order was entered on February 17, 1965:

ORDERED:

That the appeal for a variance from the side yard requirements of the R-2 District to permit a one-story and basement front and rear additions to the building at 5317 B Street, S. E., lot 5, square 5304, be granted.

From the records and the evidence adduced at the hearing, the Board finds the following facts:

- (1) Appellant's lot has a frontage of forty feet on B Street and a depth of 100 feet and contains an area of 4000 square feet of land.
- (2) The property is improved with a two-story detached dwelling with two side yards, one five feet on the west and the other seven feet on the east. The building sets back approximately 28 feet from the B Street frontage.
- (3) Appellant proposes to erect a front addition six feet in depth for the entire width of the building and the rear addition 10.5 feet in depth for the full width of the building. The front addition will be used as a living room and the rear addition will be used as a bath.
- (4) The erection of these additions will not decrease the size of the side yards and will not over occupy the lot or the rear yard.
- (5) There was no objection to the granting of this appeal registered at the public hearing.

OPINION:

We are of the opinion that appellant has proven a case of hardship within the provisions of 8207.11 of the Zoning Regulations and that a denial of the appeal will result in peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties to or exceptional and undue hardship upon the owner of the property. We are further of the opinion that this relief can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without substantially impairing the intent, purpose, and integrity of the zone plan as embodied in the zoning regulations and map.

We are further of the opinion that the location of this building with the proposed additions will not affect adversely conditions of light and air to adjoining properties.